

Investigation of Teachers' Level of Awareness of the Characteristics of Gifted Students in Terms of Different Variables

Ayşe Gül AKSU

Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University

ayseglaksu15@gmail.com

Güliz KAYMAKCI

Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University

gulizkaymakci@gmail.com

Abstract

The current study aimed to determine the awareness of teachers from different branches about the characteristics of gifted students and to examine whether this awareness varies significantly depending on gender, graduated faculty, professional experience, education level and branch. The study used the relational survey design, one of the quantitative research methods. The study group was comprised of a total of 448 teachers (297 women and 151 men) from different branches. The participants were selected by using the purposive sampling method. A questionnaire and a personal information form were administered to the teachers working in schools across different cities in Turkey in the second term of the 2022-2023 school year through digital platforms. The obtained data were analysed using the SPSS 20 software program. The study revealed that the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students is at a medium level, and it was determined that the variables of gender, graduated faculty and education level do not affect this awareness, but the variables of professional experience and branch make a significant difference. In this context, it is recommended to design various activities to increase teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students and determine the effectiveness of these activities through qualitative or mixed methods.

[This paper was published in: "EJER Congress 2023 International Eurasian Educational Research Congress Conference Proceedings," Ani Publishing, 2023, pp. 612-633]

Keywords: *Talented, Branch teacher, Quantitative research, Normal distribution statistics*

Introduction

Throughout history, various parameters such as intelligence level, creativity skills and being talented have been used to identify gifted individuals. However, in modern times, gifted individuals are defined as individuals who demonstrate high levels of performance in academic and other developmental areas compared to their peers (Worrell et al., 2019). The Ministry of

National Education defines a gifted individual as someone who, compared to their normally developing peers, learns at a faster pace, demonstrates inherent potential in leadership, creativity and artistic fields, possesses high academic ability, easily comprehends abstract ideas and concepts and independently excels in their area of interest by exhibiting a high level of performance (MEB, 2017). Contrary to the perception that gifted individuals can solve problems individually by relying on their inherent potential without external assistance, these individuals actually require personalized education, as they differ from their normally developing peers (Çitil, 2020). Otherwise, there is a risk that these individuals' potential will be wasted. It is necessary to transform existing talents into performance in enriched environments where necessary adaptations are made and expert educators work (Avcı-Engüdar, 2022). Determining the developmental areas of gifted individuals and how they differ from their peers will ensure that the individual education program that will be prepared for them is formed within the framework of the right foundations.

In Turkey, for gifted individuals to benefit from special education services, they are required to obtain a diagnosis that documents their current condition as gifted. In the diagnosis of giftedness in individuals, Science and Art Centres (BİLSEM) in Turkey have a system that includes nomination, group screening and individual assessment in various areas such as general cognitive abilities, music and visual arts (Bildiren, 2019). In the first stage of this system, which is the nomination stage, individuals can be nominated for giftedness assessment by parents, teachers, institutions, peers or the individuals themselves. However, in practice, the nomination stage is typically carried out by teachers (Ricciardi et al., 2020). There are significant differences in intelligence test scores among students nominated by teachers who have received training on the characteristics of gifted individuals compared to those nominated by teachers who have not received such training (Dereli, 2019). This shows the importance of teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted individuals.

It is thought that the current study is important in terms of measuring the current knowledge of teachers who play a key role in identifying gifted individuals, providing guidance for future studies to be conducted on the subject and filling the existing gap in the literature. There are some studies in the literature conducted to investigate teachers' awareness. For example, Paschai (2022) found in Tanzania that primary school teachers had low awareness levels about the characteristics of gifted students. Reis-Jorge et al. (2021), in their study examining the

perceptions and experiences of primary school teachers working with gifted students, found that teachers perceived giftedness primarily as cognitive superiority. In contrast, Matilda et al. (2019) examined the level of knowledge among primary school teachers in Kenya regarding gifted students and found that more than 50% of the teachers were unaware or uncertain about giftedness. Thus, this study aimed to determine the awareness of teachers from different branches about the characteristics of gifted students and to examine whether this awareness varies significantly depending on gender, graduated faculty, professional experience, education level and branch.

The main problem of this study is “What is teachers’ level of awareness of gifted students’ characteristics?”

In this connection, the sub-problems of the study are worded as follows:

1. What is teachers’ level of awareness of gifted students’ characteristics?
2. Does teachers’ level of awareness of gifted students’ characteristics vary significantly depending on gender?
3. Does teachers’ level of awareness of gifted students’ characteristics vary significantly depending on graduated faculty?
4. Does teachers’ level of awareness of gifted students’ characteristics vary significantly depending on professional experience?
5. Does teachers’ level of awareness of gifted students’ characteristics vary significantly depending on education level?
6. Does teachers’ level of awareness of gifted students’ characteristics vary significantly depending on branch?

Method

Research Design

The study employed the relational survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. This model is used to determine whether there is a covariance between variables and to assess the degree of this covariance, if there is any (Karasar, 2017).

Research Sample

The sample of this study was determined using the purposive sampling method and consists of a total of 448 teachers working in preschool, primary, special education, foreign language, science, mathematics, Turkish language, visual arts, physical education and music branches in different cities of Turkey during the second term of the 2022-2023 school year. The characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Characteristics Of the Participating Teachers

Variable	Characteristic	N	%
Gender	Female	297	66.3
	Male	151	33.7
	Total	448	100.0
Graduated Faculty	Education	378	84.4
	Science-Letter	39	8.7
	Other	31	6.9
	Total	448	100.0
Professional Experience	Less than 5 years	86	19.2
	6-10 years	85	19.0
	11-15 years	96	21.4
	16-20 years	63	14.1
	21 years and more	118	26.3
	Total	448	100.0
Education Level	Bachelor's	379	84.6
	Master's	63	14.1
	Doctorate	6	1.3

	Total	448	100.0
Branch	Special Education	87	19.4
	Pre-school	38	8.5
	Primary	88	10.6
	Science	49	10.9
	Mathematics	46	10.3
	Turkish	40	8.9
	Music	30	6.7
	Physical Education	22	4.9
	Visual Arts	22	4.9
	Foreign Language	26	5.8
	Total	448	100.0

As can be seen in Table 1, 297 of the teachers are females and 151 are males. Of the participating teachers, 378 are graduates of an education faculty, 39 are graduates of a science-letter faculty and 31 are graduates of other faculties. In terms of professional experience, 86 of the teachers have less than five years of professional experience, 85 have 6-10 years of professional experience, 96 have 11-15 years of professional experience, 63 have 16-20 years of professional experience and 118 have 21 and more years of professional experience. When the education level of the participants is examined, it is seen that 379 of them hold a bachelor's degree, 63 hold a master's degree and 6 hold a doctoral degree. Finally, 87 of the teachers are special education teachers, 38 are preschool teachers, 88 are primary teachers, 49 are science teachers, 46 are mathematics teachers, 40 are Turkish teachers, 30 are music teachers, 22 are physical education teachers, 22 are visual arts teachers and 26 are foreign language teachers.

Research Instrument and Procedure

In the current study, a five-point Likert type questionnaire consisting of 30 items, developed within the scope of the study titled "Awareness Level of Teachers about the Characteristics of

Gifted Children” by Inan, Bayındır and Kaya (2019), was used as the data collection tool to examine the teachers’ level of awareness of the characteristics of gifted students in terms of different variables. In the original study, the scale’s Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient was established as 0.84. However, in the current study, the reliability coefficient was determined to be slightly higher at 0.85. Thus, it can be concluded that the scale has sufficient reliability for this study. Additionally, in this study, the researchers used a “Personal Information Form” to gather information about the demographic characteristics of the participants, including gender, educational level, graduated faculty, branch and professional experience. The form including the “Personal Information Form” and the questionnaire developed by Bayındır and Kaya (2019) was filled online (using Google forms application) by the teachers. In the data collection process, the introductory text stating the ethical guidelines, the content of the form and the purpose of the study were presented online before the administration of the digital data collection tool. It took about 15 minutes for the teachers to fill out the digital form.

Data Analysis

In the analysis of the gathered data, various descriptive statistics were employed, including frequency and percentage calculations, arithmetic means, standard deviations, as well as statistical tests such as t-tests and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) as the data were found to show a normal distribution as a result of the normality test (Kolmogorov Smirnov). The data analysis was conducted using the statistical software package SPSS version 20.

Results

This section presents the findings pertaining to the sub-problems of the study in a sequential manner, with corresponding tables for each. The analysis conducted for the first sub-problem of the research resulted in obtaining the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the teachers’ awareness of gifted students’ characteristics, as well as the frequency and percentage distributions indicating the level of awareness. These findings are given in Table 2.

Table 2*Teachers' Level of Awareness of Gifted Students' Characteristics*

Teachers' level of awareness of gifted students' characteristics	Low	Medium	High	\bar{X}	S
	N %	N %	N %		
	0 0.0	288 64.3	160 35.7		
				106.24	10.87

Table 2 shows that the arithmetic mean of the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students is 106.24, with a standard deviation of 10.87 and 288 teachers (64.3%) have a medium level of awareness, while 160 teachers (35.7%) have a high level of awareness. There are no teachers with a low level of awareness (N=0). Therefore, it can be said that the teachers have a medium level of awareness of the characteristics of gifted students in general.

Results of the t-test carried out to investigate whether the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students varies significantly by gender are presented in Table 3.

Table 3*Results of the T-test Carried Out to Investigate Whether the Teachers' Awareness of Gifted Students' Characteristics Varies Significantly by Gender*

Awareness of the characteristics of gifted students	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Ss	sd	t	p
	Female	297	3.55	0.37	446	0.16	0.87
	Male	151	3.54	0.35			

As seen in Table 3, the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students does not vary significantly by gender [$t_{(446)} = 0.16$, $p > 0.05$]. The mean awareness score of the female teachers is $\bar{X} = 3.55$ and the mean awareness score of the male participants is $\bar{X} = 3.54$. Thus,

it can be said that the female and male teachers are equal to each other in terms of their awareness of gifted students' characteristics.

Results of the one-way variance of analysis (One-way ANOVA) conducted to investigate whether the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students varies significantly by graduated faculty are shown in Table 3.

Table 4

Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the Awareness Scores of the Teachers About the Characteristics of Gifted Students in Relation to Graduated Faculty

Awareness of the characteristics of gifted students	Graduated faculty	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>
Overall scale	Education	378	106.10	10.97
	Science-Letter	39	107.61	10.80
	Other	31	106.77	9.87
	Total	448	106.24	10.87

As seen in Table 4, 378 of the teachers graduated from an education faculty, 39 graduated from a science-letter faculty and 31 graduated from other faculties. Table 5 displays the results of the conducted analysis of variance, which aimed to determine the statistical significance of the differences between the arithmetic means.

Table 5

Results Of the ANOVA Conducted to Determine Whether the Teachers' Awareness of Gifted Students' Characteristics Varies Significantly by Graduated Faculty

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between-Groups	95.110	2	47.56	0.40	0.67
Within-Groups	52753.37	445	118.55		

Total	52848.48	447
-------	----------	-----

As seen in Table 5, the teachers' awareness of gifted students' characteristics students does not vary significantly by graduated faculty [$F_{(2-445)} = 0.40$, $p > 0.05$]. Thus, it can be inferred that the faculty from which individuals graduated does not have a significant impact on their awareness of the characteristics exhibited by gifted students.

Results of the one-way variance of analysis (One-way ANOVA) conducted to investigate whether the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students varies significantly depending on professional experience are given in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6

Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the Awareness Scores of the Teachers About the Characteristics of Gifted Students in Relation to Professional Experience

Awareness of the characteristics of gifted students	Professional experience	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>
Overall scale	Less than 5 years	86	102.38	8.56
	6-10 years	85	103.85	7.55
	11-15 years	96	104.93	12.33
	16-20 years	63	108.63	10.18
	21 years and more	118	110.55	11.85

Table 6 shows that there is a significant correlation between the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students and their professional experience. The teachers with 16-20 years and 21 and more years of professional experience were found to have a higher level of awareness of gifted students' characteristics.

Table 7

Results of the ANOVA Performed to Investigate Whether the Teachers' Awareness of Gifted Students' Characteristics Varies Significantly by Professional Experience

Source of the variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between-Groups	4486.524	4	1121.631		
Within-Groups	48361.956	443	109.169	10.27	0.00
Total	52848.480	447			

As seen in Table 7, the teachers' awareness of gifted students' characteristics varies significantly depending on professional experience [$F_{(4-443)} = 10.27$, $p < 0.05$]. To find the source of this difference, Scheffe test was performed and the results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Results of the Scheffe Test Carried Out to Find the Source of the Difference

Professional experience	Groups (i)	Groups (j)	$\bar{X}_i - \bar{X}_j$	$S\sqrt{h_X}$	<i>p</i>
Less than 5 years		6-10 years	-1.47	1.59	.93
		11-15 years	-2.55	1.55	.60
		16-20 years	-6.25*	1.73	.01
		21 years and more	-8.17*	1.48	.00
6-10 years		Less than 5 years	1.47	1.59	.93
		11-15 years	-1.07	1.55	.97
		16-20 years	-4.77	1.73	.11
		21 years and more	-6.70*	1.48	.00

11-15 years	Less than 5 years	2.55	1.55	.60
	6-10 years	1.07	1.55	.97
	16-20 years	-3.69	1.69	.31
	21 years and more	-5.62*	1.43	.00
16-20 years	Less than 5 years	6.25*	1.73	.01
	6-10 years	4.77	1.73	.11
	11-15 years	3.69	1.69	.31
	21 years and more	-1.92	1.63	.84
21 years and more	Less than 5 years	8.17*	1.48	.00
	6-10 years	6.70*	1.48	.00
	11-15 years	5.62*	1.43	.00
	16-20 years	1.92	1.63	.84

In Table 8, groups (i) and groups (j) show the groups to be compared with each other. With the help of SPSS.20 statistical program, all the groups were compared with each other and it was tried to understand whether there was a statistically significant difference. In Table 8, it is seen that the difference is between the teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years, 6-10 years and 11-15 years and the teachers with professional experience of 16-20 years and 21 and more years in favour of the teachers with professional experience of 16-20 and 21 and more years. Thus, it can be argued that as professional experience of teachers increases, their awareness of the characteristics of gifted students increases as well.

Results of the one-way variance of analysis (One-way ANOVA) conducted to investigate whether the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students varies significantly by education level are given in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9

Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the Awareness Scores of the Teachers About the Characteristics of Gifted Students in Relation to Education Level

Awareness of gifted students' characteristics	Education level	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>
Overall scale	Bachelor's	379	106.68	10.91
	Master's	63	103.58	10.71
	Doctorate	6	106.50	5.85
	Total	448	106.24	10.87

Table 9 shows that 379 of the teachers hold a bachelor's degree, 63 hold a master's degree and 6 hold a doctoral degree. Table 10 presents the outcomes of the analysis of variance conducted to assess the statistical significance of the differences between the arithmetic means.

Table 10

Results of the ANOVA Conducted to Determine Whether the Teachers' Awareness of Gifted Students' Characteristics Varies Significantly by Education Level

Source of the variance	Sum of squares	<i>Sd</i>	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between-Groups	517.341	2	258.670		
Within-Groups	52331.139	445	117.598	2.20	0.11
Total	52848.480	447			

As seen in Table 10, the teachers' awareness of gifted students' characteristics does not vary significantly by education level [$F_{(2-445)} = 2.20$, $p > 0.05$]. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the educational attainment level of teachers does not result in a significant disparity in their awareness of the characteristics exhibited by gifted students.

Results of the one-way variance of analysis (One-way ANOVA) conducted to investigate whether the teachers' awareness of the characteristics of gifted students varies significantly depending on branch are given in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11

Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the Awareness Scores of the Teachers About Gifted Students' Characteristics in Relation to Branch

Awareness of the characteristics of gifted students	Branch	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>S</i>
Over scale	Pre-school	38	108.39	11.41
	Special Education	87	103.19	11.05
	Primary	88	108.89	12.08
	Science	49	103.75	8.74
	Mathematics	46	106.56	10.92
	Turkish	40	107.47	9.73
	Foreign Language	26	106.92	9.79
	Visual Arts	22	106.86	10.42
	Music	30	105.53	10.84
	Physical Education	22	106.13	9.66
	Total	448	106.24	10.87

As seen in Table 11, 87 of the teachers are special education teachers, 38 are preschool teachers, 88 are primary teachers, 49 are science teachers, 46 are mathematics teachers, 40 are Turkish teachers, 30 are music teachers, 22 are physical education teachers, 22 are visual arts teachers and 26 are foreign language teachers. Table 12 displays the results of the performed analysis of variance, which aimed to ascertain the statistical significance of the differences between the arithmetic means.

Table 12

Results of the ANOVA Conducted to Determine Whether the Teachers' Awareness of Gifted Students' Characteristics Varies Significantly by Branch

Source of the variance	Sum of squares	<i>Sd</i>	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between-Groups	2008.808	9	223.201		
Within-Groups	50839.672	438	116.072	1.92	0.04
Total	52848.480	447			

As seen in Table 12, the teachers' awareness of gifted students' characteristics varies significantly depending on branch [$F_{(9-438)} = 1.92$, $p < 0.05$]. To identify the source of this difference, a Scheffe test was conducted, and the outcomes of this test are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Results of the Scheffe Test Performed to Find the Source of the Difference

Branch	Groups (i)	Groups (j)	$\bar{X}_i - \bar{x}_j$	$S\sqrt{h_x}$	<i>p</i>
Special Education		Preschool	-5.19	2.09	0.72
		Primary	-5.70	1.62	0.20
		Science	-0.55	1.92	1.00
		Turkish	-4.27	2.05	0.88
		Mathematics	-3.36	1.96	0.96
		Music	-2.33	2.28	0.99
		Physical Education	-2.94	2.57	0.99
		Visual Arts	-3.66	2.57	0.99

Preschool	Foreign Language	-3.72	2.40	0.98
	Special Education	5.19	2.09	0.72
	Primary	-0.50	2.09	1.00
	Science	4.63	2.32	0.91
	Turkish	0.91	2.44	1.00
	Mathematics	1.82	2.36	1.00
	Music	2.86	2.63	0.99
	Physical Education	2.25	2.88	1.00
	Visual Arts	1.53	2.88	1.00
Primary	Foreign Language	1.47	2.74	1.00
	Special Education	5.70	1.62	0.20
	Preschool	0.50	2.09	1.00
	Science	5.14	1.92	0.61
	Turkish	1.42	2.05	1.00
	Mathematics	2.33	1.96	0.99
	Music	3.36	2.27	0.98
	Physical Education	2.76	2.56	0.99
	Visual Arts	2.03	2.50	1.00
Science	Foreign Language	1.97	2.40	1.00
	Special Education	0.55	1.92	1.00
	Preschool	-4.63	2.32	0.91
	Primary	-5.14	1.92	0.61
	Turkish	-3.71	2.29	0.97
	Mathematics	-2.81	2.21	0.99

Turkish	Music	-1.77	2.49	1.00
	Physical Education	-2.38	2.76	1.00
	Visual Arts	-3.10	2.76	0.99
	Foreign Language	-3.16	2.61	0.99
	Special Education	4.27	2.05	0.88
	Preschool	-9.91	2.44	1.00
	Turkish	-1.41	2.05	1.00
	Science	3.71	2.29	0.97
	Mathematics	0.90	2.32	1.00
	Music	1.94	2.60	1.00
Mathematics	Physical Education	1.33	2.85	1.00
	Visual Arts	0.61	2.85	1.00
	Foreign Language	0.55	2.71	1.00
	Special Education	3.36	1.96	0.96
	Preschool	-1.82	2.36	1.00
	Primary	-2.33	1.96	0.99
	Science	2.81	2.21	0.99
	Turkish	-0.90	2.32	1.00
	Music	1.03	2.52	1.00
	Physical Education	0.42	2.79	1.00
Music	Visual Arts	-0.29	2.79	1.00
	Foreign Language	-0.35	2.64	1.00
	Special Education	2.33	2.28	0.99
	Preschool	-2.86	2.63	0.99

	Primary	-3.36	2.27	0.98
	Science	1.77	2.49	1.00
	Turkish	-1.94	2.60	1.00
	Mathematics	-1.03	2.52	1.00
	Physical Education	-0.60	3.02	1.00
	Visual Arts	-1.33	3.02	1.00
	Foreign Language	-1.38	2.88	1.00
Physical Education	Special Education	2.94	2.57	0.99
	Preschool	-2.25	2.88	1.00
	Primary	-2.76	2.56	0.99
	Science	2.38	2.76	1.00
	Turkish	-1.33	2.85	1.00
	Mathematics	-0.42	2.79	1.00
	Music	0.60	3.02	1.00
	Visual Arts	-0.72	3.24	1.00
	Foreign Language	-0.78	3.12	1.00
Visual Arts	Special Education	3.36	2.57	0.99
	Preschool	-1.53	2.88	1.00
	Primary	-2.03	2.56	1.00
	Science	3.10	2.76	0.99
	Turkish	-0.61	2.85	1.00
	Mathematics	0.29	2.79	1.00
	Music	1.33	3.02	1.00
	Physical Education	0.72	3.24	1.00

	Foreign Language	-0.05	3.12	1.00
Foreign Language	Special Education	3.72	2.40	0.98
	Preschool	-1.47	2.72	1.00
	Primary	-1.97	2.40	1.00
	Science	3.16	2.61	0.99
	Turkish	-0.55	2.71	1.00
	Mathematics	0.35	2.64	1.00
	Music	0.38	2.88	1.00
	Physical Education	0.78	3.12	1.00
	Visual Arts	0.59	3.12	1.00

In Table 13, groups (i) and groups (j) show the groups of branches to be compared with each other. With the help of SPSS.20 statistical program, all the groups of branches were compared with each other, and it was tried to understand whether there was a statistically significant difference. According to Table 13, the difference is between the special education and primacy teachers in favour of the special education teachers. It is also seen that the awareness means of the primary and preschool teachers are higher than those of the other teachers.

Discussion

The current study aimed to investigate the teachers' level of awareness of the characteristics of gifted students and to investigate the influence of gender, graduated faculty, professional experience, educational level and branch on their awareness.

Based on the study's findings, it was determined that the teachers possess a medium level of awareness regarding the characteristics exhibited by gifted students. In the literature, the study conducted by Paschai (2022) on primary school teachers' awareness of gifted students' characteristics found that the teachers' awareness is low. In the current study, the variables of gender, graduated faculty and education level were found to have no significant effect on the awareness of gifted students' characteristics. Contrary to these findings, Gerçek-Abanoz (2021) conducted a study examining the self-efficacy and attitudes of primary teachers with and without gifted students in their classrooms and found that the female teachers have higher self-

efficacy than the male teachers in the variable of mentoring. Bolat (2019) conducted a study on teachers' awareness of gifted students' characteristics and found a significant difference in favour of the teachers who are the graduates of education faculties. It is thought that the reason for this may be the fact that the teachers who graduated from the education faculties are given the pedagogical content knowledge courses more comprehensively during their undergraduate education. In the study conducted by Gerçek-Abanoz (2022) to examine the self-efficacy and attitudes of primary teachers with and without gifted students, it was found that the teachers who had completed a master's degree had a higher rate of nominating their students for Science and Art Centres (BİLSEMs) and higher rates of their students being placed in BİLSEMs compared to teachers with a bachelor's degree. It is thought that the reason for this result may be the content of the courses taken by the primary teachers during their graduate education or the studies they have made on the diagnosis and education of gifted individuals in the literature. In the current study, the variables of professional experience and branch were found to have significant effects of the level of awareness. The teachers with professional experience of 16-20 years and 21 and more years were found to have significantly higher awareness compared to the other teachers. This may indicate that as the years of professional experience increase, the awareness of gifted students' characteristics also increases among teachers. Finally, the teachers' level of awareness was found to vary significantly depending on the variable of branch between the special education teachers and primary teachers in favour of the primary teachers. Bildiren et al. (2020) found that preschool teachers describe their self-efficacy in identifying and training gifted people as weak. Yıldız (2020), on the other hand, revealed that the self-efficacy of primary teachers regarding the education of gifted students is medium and that they need in-service training. Svalina et al. (2021) determined that primary school teachers do not have enough knowledge to distinguish gifted students in the field of music. It is thought that the elective courses taken during the undergraduate education and the individual preferences of teachers in in-service training in their professional life can make a difference in awareness of gifted students' characteristics among teachers from different branches.

Conclusion

In the current study, the teachers' level of awareness of gifted students' characteristics was determined to be medium. It was also found that factors such as gender, type of graduated faculty and education level did not create a significant difference in teachers' awareness of

gifted students' characteristics. However, teachers with professional experience of 16-20 years and 21 and more years have higher levels of awareness compared to the other teachers. It was also determined that the variable of branch of teachers affected their awareness of gifted students' characteristics, and the highest level of awareness was observed among primary teachers.

Recommendations

Future research can examine the awareness of teachers from more branches regarding the characteristics of gifted students. They can also determine the effectiveness of training provided to teachers in recent years in this regard. Additionally, the number of courses focused on gifted students can be increased in higher education teacher training programs. Awareness training programs can be developed specifically for teachers with less professional experience with the aim of enhancing their ability to identify gifted students at an early stage.

References

- Avcı-Engüdar, N. (2021). *Fen bilgisi öğretmen eğitim programının özel yetenekliler için bireyselleştirilmiş öğretim uygulama yeterliği kazandırma açısından incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Balıkesir Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Balıkesir.
- Bildiren, A. (2019). Özel yetenekli çocukların tanınması. In E. R. Özmen & A. Ataman (Eds.), *Öğrenme güçlüğü ve özel yetenek* (pp. 239-255). Maya Akademi.
- Bildiren, A., Gür, G., Sağkal, A. S., & Özdemir, Y. (2020). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin üstün yetenekli çocukların tanınması ve eğitimlerine ilişkin algıları. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(2), 329-356. <https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.572326>
- Bolat, Y. (2019). Öğretmenlerin üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin özelliklerine yönelik farkındalık düzeylerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(30), 25-41. <https://doi.org/10.29329/mjer.2019.218.2>
- Çitil, M. (2020). Geçmişten günümüze Türkiye’de üstün yeteneklilerin eğitimi: Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Ataman ile görüşme. *Çocuk ve Medeniyet Dergisi*, 5(10), 511-524. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/cm/issue/59377/851994>

- Dereli, F. (2019). *Okul öncesi dönemdeki üstün yetenekli çocukların aday gösterilmelerine yönelik geliştirilen eğitim programının etkililiği* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Gerçek-Abanoz, S. (2021). *Üstün yetenekli öğrencisi olan ile olmayan sınıf öğretmenlerinin üstün yetenekli eğitime ilişkin öz yeterlikleri ve tutumlarının karşılaştırılması* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Kırklareli Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kırklareli.
- İnan, H., Z., Bayındır N., & Demir, S. (2009). Awareness level of teachers about the characteristics of gifted children. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 3(3), 2519-2527. <http://www.ajbasweb.com/old/ajbas/2009/2519-2527.pdf>
- Karasar, N. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, İlkeler, Yetenekler*. Nobel.
- Matilda, M., Kariuki, M., Omulema, B. E. E. (2019). Assessment of teacher awareness of gifted children and resource availability for their learning in regular primary schools of mwatate Sub-County, Kenya. *African Research Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 2312-0134. <https://arjess.org/education-research/assessment-of-teacher-awareness-of-gifted-children-and-resource-availability-for-their-learning-in-regular-public-primary-schools-of-mwatate-sub-county-kenya.pdf>
- Paschal, M. J. (2022). Investigating teachers' awareness of gifted children and resource accessibility for their learning in Tanzania. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 27(4), 9-31. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2022/v27i430660>
- Reis-Jorge, J., Ferreira, M., Olcina-Sempere, G., & Marques, B. (2021). Perceptions of giftedness and classroom practice with gifted children an exploratory study of primary school teachers. *Qualitative Research in Education*, 10(3), 291-315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17583/qre.8097>
- Ricciardi, C., Haag-Wolf, A., & Winsler, A. (2020). Factors associated with gifted identification for ethnically diverse children in poverty. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 64(4), 243-258.

- Svalina, V., Sušić, B. B., & Lapat, G. (2021). Primary school teachers' opinions towards musically gifted students. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 79(1), 133-161. <https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/21.79.133>
- Yıldız, A. (2020). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin eğitime yönelik tutum, öz-yeterlik ve eğitim ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesi. *Turkish Studies-Educational Sciences*, 15(1), 417-430. <https://doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.39933>
- Worrell, F., Subotnik, R., Dixon, D., & Dixson, D. (2019). Gifted students. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 551- 576.